

## REMARKS

### **Present Status of the Application**

1. Applicant has noted the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in Claim 6 if properly amended as suggested by the Examiner with great appreciation. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 6 as suggested by the Examiner. After entry of the amendments to claim 6, it is believed that claims 6-8 are in proper conditions for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

2. The Office Action objected to claims 1-8 because of some grammatical errors and the Examiner suggested to amend claims 1-8.

In response thereto, Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for pointing out the informalities and accordingly amended the claims 1-8. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

3. Furthermore, the Office Action rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for failing to comply with written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in a such way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor(s), at the time of the invention, had possession of the invention.

In rejecting the above claims, the Examiner stated that as per claim 1, the sequential step from (d) to (e) is not disclosed in the specification. By comparing the language in Claim 1, and the flow chart in FIG. 19, the step of (d) is item 704 and the step of (e) is item 706. There is no indication that there is a linkage between 704 and 706. In addition, the process in item 705 as claimed in step of (d) does not contain a linkage to item 706 (step (e)) as well.

In response thereto, Applicant respectfully submit that from step (b) (702) is linked to the step (d) (704), and the step (d) (704) including the sub-step (705) is linked to the step (e) (706). Thus, the steps (d) and (e) run series as clearly shown in FIG. 19. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits since all the steps are interrelated or interlinked and the FIG. 19 clearly shows all of the steps in the flowchart (of the method) that are properly interlinked are being claimed in claim 1, and therefore the claim 1 complies with the current US patent practice. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the above rejections is respectfully requested.

4. As per claim 3, the Examiner stated that claim 3 recites “wherein the writing proceeds to step (k) if no in said step (d). However, step (d) which corresponds to item 704 of FIG. 19 does not indicate Yes or No, as being claimed.

In response thereto, Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for pointing out the error and accordingly canceled claim 3 without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

5. Furthermore, Applicant has amended the specification (paragraph [0031]) in order to correct some minor typographical errors.

It is believed that no new matter has been added by way of amendments made to claims and specification, or otherwise to the application.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-8 are in proper condition for allowance and reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.


Application serial No. 10/709,167  
Examiner: VO, THANH DUC  
Art Unit: 2189

Applicant: Ming-Nen Liang

### CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1-8 of the present application are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted

  
Khein-Seng Dua

Date: 07/17/2006  
Title: President  
Phison Electronics Corp.  
2F-4, No. 148, Sec. 4, Chung Hsiao E. Rd.,  
Taipei 106, Taiwan, R.O.C.  
Tel: +886-2-8771-8948  
Fax: +886-2-8771-9757  
E-mail: foreign@yc-patent.com